

REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 20, 24, 28, and 35-40 are now pending, with claims 20, 24, 28, 36, 38, and 40 being independent. Claims 21, 25, 29, and 32-34 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 35-40 are new. Claims 20, 24, and 28 have been amended. Support for the new claims and amendments can be found throughout the originally filed disclosure, including, for example, at page 33, line 27 through page 34, line 18, of the specification. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the amendments and new claims do not include new matter.

Claims 24, 25, and 33 are rejection in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Without necessarily conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicant has amended independent claim 24 in the manner suggested at page 2, paragraph 2, of the Office Action. Specifically, claim 24 recites that the steps “are performed by a first calculation unit, a decision unit, and a second calculation unit, an adjusting unit, and a selection unit, respectively, in a document printing system.” As such, Applicant submits that the claimed steps are clearly recited as being performed by a machine, i.e., the units of the document printing system. Thus, claims 24, 25, and 33 clearly recite statutory subject matter, and the Section 101 should be withdrawn.

Claims 20 is rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,650) in view of Hino (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0036788), Yudasaka et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0202211), and Yoshida (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,634). Claims 24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Cedar et al. in view of Hino and Yudasaka et al. Claims 21 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedar et al. in view of Hino, Yudasaka et al., Yoshida, and Hertzfeld (U.S. Patent No. 6,441,824). Claims 25, 29, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedar et al. in view of Hino, Yudasaka et al., and Hertzfeld.

Applicant respectfully traverses the art rejections. Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution of the application, independent claims 20, 24, and 28 have been amended to clarify features of the invention not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. To this end, Applicant submits that the claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 20 recites a document printing system comprising, inter alia, a selection unit for (i) selecting a first font in a specified typeface without changing its weight if a font size is larger than or equal to a first size, (ii) selecting a second font with the thinnest weight in the specified typeface, even where the first font in the specified typeface and weight exist, if the font size is smaller than the first size and is larger than or equal to a second size, and (iii) selecting a third font in a certain typeface regardless of the specified typeface, even where the first font in the specified typeface and weight exists, if the font size is smaller than the second size. Amended independent claim 24 recites a method, and amended independent claim 28 recites a computer-readable medium storing a program to execute a method, both of which include selection steps with analogous features to the selection unit recited in amended independent claim 20.

By such features of the invention, the weight of a font in a specified typeface can be replaced when characters become smaller so that the characters remain intelligible. Further,

when the characters become even smaller, the typeface may be replaced in order to still maintain intelligibility of the characters. Thus, the claimed invention makes it possible to enhance the intelligibility of the characters while maintaining the font style where possible.

The Office Action cites Cedar et al. as disclosing some of the features of the invention. The Office Action acknowledges that Cedar et al. does not disclose some of the features of the claimed selection unit, including selecting a font with the thinnest weight in a specified typeface, and selecting a font in a certain typeface regardless of the specified typeface. The Office Action further asserts, however, that Yoshida suggests these features of the invention.

Applicant submits, however, that the combination of Cedar et al. and Yoshida does not suggest the selection unit and selection steps recited in amended independent claims 20, 24, and 28. Yoshida, in the particular passages cited in the Office Action, discloses a procedure for selecting a thickening parameter for a character generating apparatus. Col. 10, lines 59-62. In this procedure of Yoshida, a check is performed to determine whether requested weight data has been stored. See Figure 22, step 2; col. 11, lines 5-7. If the requested weight data has not been stored, Yoshida discloses a thickening or narrowing process is performed to output a character with the requested weight. Col. 11, lines 21-24. Yoshida notes that the result obtained by the thickening process deteriorates less than the result obtained through the narrowing process, and thus, a check is performed to determine whether data for a weight smaller than the requested weight is stored in the storage device. Col. 11, lines 26-32. Smaller weight data is thereby used in a thickening process if the smaller weight data is available, whereas larger weight data is used in a narrowing process if the smaller weight data is not available. Col. 11, lines 33-61. It is important to note that the thickening or narrowing process disclosed by Yoshida only occurs if the requested weight data is not previously stored. That is, the step of Yoshida wherein a check

is performed to determine whether data for a weight smaller than the requested weight are stored in the storage device, and the subsequent step wherein the thickening or narrowing process are effected only occur if character weight data is not previously stored in the first place.

As such, assuming, arguendo, that the disclosure of Yoshida can be combined with the disclosure of Cedar et al., Applicant submits the combination of reference still does not suggest all of the features of the claimed selecting unit and selection steps. In particular, the references do not suggest selecting a second font with the thinnest weight in a specified typeface, even where a first font in the specified typeface and weight exist, if a font size is smaller than a first size and is larger than or equal to a second size, and selecting a third font in a certain typeface regardless of the specified typeface, even where the first font in the specified typeface and weight exists, if the font size is smaller than the second size. As noted above, the Office Action acknowledges that Cedar et al. does not disclose these features. Further, as discussed above, the thickening or narrowing process disclosed by Yoshida only occurs if the weight data is not previously stored. Hence, Yoshida cannot be taken to suggest selecting the claimed second font or third font “even where the first font in the specified typeface and weight exist.” Just the opposite, if the weight data is stored (“exists”) in the system of Yoshida, the thickening or narrowing process does not occur.

Applicant further submits that the cited references to Hino, Yudasaka et al., and Hertzfeld fail to cure the deficiencies of Cedar et al. and Yoshida. Hino, Yudasaka et al., and Hertzfeld are cited in the Office Action as suggesting various features of the claimed invention. Applicant submits, however, that none of these references discloses or suggests a selection unit or selection step with the features recited in amended independent claims 20, 24, and 28. Thus, these references fail to deficiencies of Cedar et al. and Yoshida discussed above.

With respect to new independent claims 36, 38, and 40, these claims also recite a selection unit or selection step. More specifically, these claims recite that the selection unit or selection steps selects a font with the with thinnest weight in a specified typeface so that the typeface become intelligible if the font size is smaller than a first size and is larger than or equal to a second size, and selects a font in a certain typeface regardless of the specified typeface so that characters become intelligible if the font size is smaller than the second size. These claims further recite an outputting unit or step for outputting the font selected by the selection unit or step. Applicant notes that the thickening or narrowing process disclosed by Yoshida only occurs if the weight data is not previously stored, as discussed above. Hence, the reference cannot be understood to suggest selecting a font in a certain typeface “regardless of the specified typeface so that characters become intelligible if the font size is smaller than the second size.” Moreover, Yoshida does not output a selected font in the cases where the thickening or narrowing process occurs, but rather outputs the thickened or narrowed font. Hence, Yoshida cannot be said to suggest the combination of selection and output features recited in new independent claims 36, 38, and 40.

For at least the forgoing reasons, Applicant submits that the references cited in the Office Action, whether taken individually or collectively, fail to disclose or suggest the invention recited the independent claims of the present application. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejections should be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action, and a Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. Office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 4699643_1